only adherents of the Orthodox religion might hold land, and the following year the writing of Lithuanian in Latin characters was forbidden. In 1894 Catholics were forbidden to hold any position, however small, in the central or local administrative services. None the less, the end of the century saw the foundation of a nationalist movement, led by Dr. Basanavicius, and the acquisition by the peasantry of a certain amount of land in small-holdings through the establishment of land banks and co-operative societies. In 1904 the law forbidding the printing of the Lithuanian language in Latin characters was repealed, and the flood of nationalist literature increased in volume.

In the other Provinces the situation of the peasants was even worse than in Lithuania, owing to the presence of the Baltic Barons, who were always loyal subjects of the Tsars, and who from the outset took a leading part in the administration of the Russian Empire. Under Russian rule the Barons secured the restoration of all privileges of which they had been deprived under the Swedish régime; moreover, they now created a closed corporation, consisting of 172 families which alone had the right to own land. Various attempts made by successive Tsars to improve the lot of the peasants were frustrated by the Barons, and serious rebellions were put down in 1783–4 and again in 1802. After the latter, Alexander I issued an ordinance in 1804 limiting serfdom, but its effects were nullified by the Barons. Laws abolishing personal serfdom altogether in Estonia (1816), Courland (1817), and Livonia (1819)[1] did little to improve matters, since freedom was of little use to peasants with no claim either to tenancy or ownership of land. In 1849, however, Alexander II enacted a new Agrarian Law abolishing forced labour and providing for the purchase or hire of certain lands by the peasant communes. Under Alexander III (1881–94) a determined policy of Russification was initiated, aimed as much at the German as at the native population; indeed, the later native movement of 1905 may be traced largely to the indirect encouragement which it now received from the Russian Government's anti-German policy. Russian law and police organization were substituted for the existing German system, and the Russian language was made compulsory in schools. On the other hand, Letts and Estonians were allowed to hold Government posts. Towards the end of the century, too, there was an improvement in the material status of the peasantry; the Russian railways brought trade to the ports of Riga and Libau, and in the towns a small proletarian class grew up which was ripe for the spread of revolutionary ideas. As in Lithuania, nationalist movements were set on foot, and Young Lett and Estonian parties were formed.

These movements, in all three countries, were quick to exploit the

[1] The first emancipation of serfs in the whole Empire was in the Baltic Provinces.

186 weakening of the Russian control which resulted from Russia's defeat
●668 by Japan; the revolution which spread throughout the Empire in 1905 had its repercussions in the Baltic Provinces. In Latvia and Estonia there were peasant risings which developed into *jacqueries* of a peculiarly savage character; harvests were burnt, agricultural machines were destroyed, and considerable damage was done to the large German-Balt and ecclesiastical estates. In Latvia the rising was not only the work of the peasantry, but also of the Social-Democratic party and of a nationalist revolutionary movement known as the *Savieniba*. Petitions were addressed to the Russian Government for universal franchise, freedom of the press and of assembly, the right to teach Lettish in the schools, &c.; and a [665] Provisional Revolutionary Government was established in Riga. In Lithuania two congresses were summoned to meet simultaneously in Vilna on December 4, 1905; one, consisting of representatives of all the Lithuanian associations, elected Dr. Basanavicius as its president, and voted a resolution demanding the creation of an autonomous Lithuania within ethnographic limits. The other, a congress of the Peasant Union which had been founded by a certain Gabrys, decided not to pay any taxes, to dismiss Russian teachers and pro-Russian municipal authorities, and to establish Lithuanian courts.

661 The disturbances were finally suppressed with the utmost ruthlessness by Russian troops, with the assistance of the German Barons; 3,000 Letts were said to have been tried by court martial, about half their number being sentenced to death. The promises made by the Tsar in the stress of the emergency were not kept, or kept only in part, although each of the Provinces was allowed to send representatives to the Russian Duma which was now brought into existence. [167] Under the Stolypin Government severe measures of repression were introduced; many of the nationalist leaders, such as Karl Ulmanis in Latvia and Konstantin Paets in Estonia, were driven into exile, and a system of colonization was introduced with the object of encouraging a German 'non-native' class of small-holders which would [186] tend to support the *status quo*. None the less, in spite of the Russian Government's repressive policy, the national spirit which had failed to carry the day in 1905 survived, in one form or another, until the world upheaval in 1914 provided the occasion for a fresh outburst of activity.

II. THE WORLD WAR AND THE EMERGENCE OF THE INDEPENDENT STATES

726 Four factors contributed to the making of the new Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania during the World War: the fall of the Russian Empire; the German occupation of the border provinces

of its sessions', to a Committee of Elders and to the Administration. 648
The Baltic Barons, on the other hand, declared themselves the sole 186
authorized representatives of the people, proclaimed the definite 642
separation of Estonia from Russia, and appealed to Germany for military aid against the Bolsheviks.

The immediate consequence of the Proclamation of November 28 [669]
was the temporary arrest of M. Paets and the dispersal of the National Council by the Bolsheviks, who, however, allowed the elections to the Constituent Assembly to take place during January 1918, in the hope of getting a majority of votes for their own candidates. When it became clear that they would not do so, a civil war broke out which was only ended by the arrival of the German armies in February. On February 24, the single day left to them between the flight of the Bolsheviks and the coming of the Germans, the Committee of Elders seized the opportunity to promulgate a manifesto reaffirming Estonia's independence as a Republican State, defining her frontiers, and instituting a Provisional Government under M. Paets. The German occupation during the following months postponed all further constitutional development until after the Armistice of November 11, 1918.

Latvia. The history of the Lettish nationalist movement up to the 648
signature of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in March 1918 ran a some- 186
what similar course, and thereafter suffered a similar temporary 668 ●
eclipse until the Armistice was signed; for, although the southern half of what is now Latvia, with the exception of Latgale, was from the summer of 1915 onwards under German occupation, Lettish nationalists in the northern half and in Petrograd were able to conduct negotiations with the Imperial and Provisional Governments in Russia, and later to defy the Bolshevik authorities in much the same way as did the Estonian leaders, though with rather less success.

Towards the end of the Imperialist régime, when half the inhabi- [575]
tants of Courland were refugees in Russia, the Lettish deputies of the Duma, together with representatives of the exiled Letts, among them J. Čakste and Z. A. Meierovics, formed a Latvian Refugees' Committee in Petrograd, which tried to obtain promises of autonomy and reform from the Government. When the Provisional Government assumed authority in the spring of 1917, they were urged to establish an autonomous administrative district consisting of southern Livonia, Courland, and parts of Vitebsk; less amenable to Lettish than to Estonian entreaties, they did, however, issue decrees appointing new and more democratic-minded governors and permitting elections to local government bodies in the unoccupied districts.

In Latvia, as in Estonia, the Bolshevik Revolution precipitated

matters. On November 16, 1917, representatives of all parties in the unoccupied territory, except the Bolsheviks, met at Walk (in Livonia) and formed a Latvian National Council. Complete independence was implicit, though not explicit, in the declaration of the Council that Latvia was an autonomous unit whose status, and whose domestic and foreign policy, could only be decided by a Latvian Constituent Assembly. Meanwhile, in December, M. Karl Ulmanis and the other Lettish leaders, who had been working under cover in the occupied territory, formed a secret democratic *bloc* in Riga, consisting of all except the Germanophil and Bolshevik groups, which made a declaration similar to that of the National Council at Walk.

The Bolshevik reply to such action was to abolish the local government bodies set up by the Provisional Government, to issue new electoral decrees which excluded the bulk of the peasantry—as being counter-revolutionary in their outlook—from the franchise, to suppress the National Council, and to establish Red Guards throughout the unoccupied districts. But their military situation was becoming desperate; the Germans were advancing, and negotiations for Brest-Litovsk were in process. The Latvian nationalists took courage; on January 5, 1918, the Lettish leader, M. Janis Goldmanis, reaffirmed before the All-Russian Constituent Assembly, convened in Petrograd, the resolutions of the National Council at Walk. The Council itself met again on January 15 in Petrograd to declare Courland, South Livonia, and Latgale an independent democratic Republic, and to create administrative machinery and an embryo Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Almost immediately France granted *de facto* recognition to the new Latvian Government.

[727] By the end of February, however, the whole of Livonia was under German occupation, and the Brest-Litovsk Treaty recognized a German protectorate in Courland and a temporary German 'police occupation' in Livonia. The nationalist movement was driven to ground until after the Armistice, although, in July 1918, the National Council met to proclaim Latvia's independence under an international protectorate, and to send MM. Čakste and Meierovics and other representatives abroad to secure recognition and support from the Allied Powers.

Lithuania. Since practically the whole of Lithuania was in German occupation from the autumn of 1915 onwards, the movement for independence developed there on somewhat different lines from the Latvian and Estonian movements; it was less affected by the political and military history and military fortunes of Russia than by those of Germany. Tolerance of its existence and concessions to its aspirations had to be won, not so much from the Provisional Government or the Bolsheviks, as from the German military author-

[1918--Analyst]

ities. At first it must have seemed possible to the Lithuanian deputies in the Duma, who, early in 1917, organized a Lithuanian National Council in Petrograd to demand political autonomy, that Russia might yet prove strong enough to protect, and generous enough to grant autonomy to, her border provinces; for, although after the fall of the Imperial Government they notified their compatriots in both German and Russian Lithuania, without permission of the Provisional Government, of the existence of the Lithuanian National Council, and appointed a provisional administrative committee to deal with Lithuanian affairs in Russia, yet, at a general conference of Lithuanians in Petrograd some months later, while extremists were demanding complete independence and the convocation of a Constituent Assembly, the more moderate elements were still in favour of a *rapprochement* with the Provisional Government. The latter, however, by ignoring their advances and refusing to make any promises such as had been made to Finland, Poland, or Estonia, lost the last opportunity of keeping the Lithuanian nationalist movement within their control. Finally, when the Bolshevik Government suppressed the Lithuanian National Council, a conference, attended by all but the extreme Left parties, was organized at Voronezh to take its place; this defined the frontiers and outlined the constitutional programme of a new independent Lithuanian Republic, demanded the immediate evacuation of the German armies and free access to the Baltic Sea, and decided to bring its claim to the attention of the Allied Powers.

2. The German Occupation

After suffering the ravages of the retreating Russian army, the Baltic Provinces were subjected, for a period varying from three years in Lithuania and Courland to nearly a year in Estonia and Livonia, to all the miseries of a German military occupation, with its accompaniments of rigorous requisitioning and political terrorization. In spite of its devastating economic effects, however, the German occupation probably saved the Provinces from irretrievable submergence in the Soviet Union, and, as things turned out, by keeping the Bolsheviks out, made independence ultimately possible when the Germans in their turn should have suffered military defeat by the Allies.

Estonia and Latvia. The failure, during this period, of the efforts of the German military authorities, supported by the German-Baltic Barons, to threaten or cajole the peoples of any of the three Provinces into adopting some form of federation with Germany, is an indication that the Baltic races felt that they had more to fear from German than from Russian domination. The German plans

727 included the creation of a Duchy of Courland and a Duchy of Estonia
648 and Livonia in personal union with the Crown of Prussia, and the organization of extensive German colonization in those Provinces. To this end, in each Province the old *Landtag* and *Landesrat*, consisting of representatives of the Baltic Barons, were hastily revived. On March 8, 1918, the *Landesrat* of Courland invited the Kaiser to accept the Grand-ducal crown of Courland; the invitation was graciously accepted. An unsuccessful attempt was made to persuade the district Elders of Estonia and Livonia, summoned to a conference at Riga on April 10 for the purpose, to consent to union with the Prussian Crown; the fear of German colonization was too strong. M. Konstantin Paets, the chief organizer of resistance to such a scheme, was imprisoned in a Polish concentration camp. In default of popular consent, Baron Dellingshausen, the leader of the Baltic Barons in Estonia, sent a request for union to the Kaiser, who con-
[423] veyed his 'consent' to it on April 21. In July 1918 agrarian regulations were issued providing for a Colonization Union in Courland, at whose disposal the Baltic Barons placed a third of their landed property for the purpose of fresh German colonization: all private land agreements for the last thirty years were to be annulled, without any provision being made for expropriated peasants.

728 *Lithuania.* In Lithuania, hoping to make capital out of the Russian
649 Provisional Government's unsympathetic attitude towards the
186 Lithuanian nationalists, and with a view to creating a body which
● [661] would lend itself to the furtherance of annexation schemes, the German authorities rashly permitted a nationalist movement to take shape in the autumn of 1917. Immediately after the Russian evacuation of Vilna, a conference of over 200 leaders, selected by an organizing committee, met there and passed a resolution that Lithuania should become an independent democratic State within her ethnographic frontiers, and that a Constituent Assembly should be convened. The conference appointed, for the conduct of affairs in the interim period, a National Council or *Taryba*, consisting of twenty-six members, including six representatives of minorities, with M. Antanas Smetona as its president. Under German pressure, the *Taryba* adopted further resolutions on December 11, which, while claiming the reconstitution of an independent State with Vilna as its capital, omitted all mention of a Constituent Assembly, and even asked for German aid during the period of reconstruction in the form of a 'perpetual and solid alliance' with the German Empire. In a rescript of March 23, 1918, the Kaiser granted *de jure* recognition of Lithuanian independence on the basis of the December resolutions; but by this time the *Taryba*, realizing the character of the peace negotiations with Russia at Brest-Litovsk, to which they had been refused per-

1: Anonymous U-4 (no date) 1938 RB1 Baltic States RB1 Estonia

665 [196] and formed the Workers' Party, or 'Kaaver-Socialist' group, secured six seats. In 1930 this group was dissolved and its seats distributed among the other parties, while the Communist party had already been declared illegal after a *putsch* engineered from Moscow in December 1924. The solidarity of the nation against Communism was illustrated by the energetic suppression of this *putsch* by General Laidoner, and the formation of a grand coalition of all the major parties, including the Social-Democrats, under Dr. Jaakson. Martial law, which had been proclaimed throughout the country, was thereafter retained permanently in certain frontier zones and on all railways; and, although during the following years plots were from time to time discovered, Communism never again got out of hand to the extent of being a national danger.

642 *Constitutional Reform.* As early as 1924 the question of constitutional revision was raised by Dr. Jaakson in his Ministerial Declaration immediately after the Communist *putsch*, when he suggested the desirability of separating the functions of the President of the State from those of the Prime Minister. Bills to that effect were unsuccessfully introduced in the Assembly by the parties of the Right in February 1925 and July 1926, while the Labour party tabled a [666] separate Bill in 1926 for halving the number of deputies in the Assembly; in the same year the Assembly actually adopted a modification of the electoral law, requiring a deposit from every candidate and a minimum of two successful candidates for representation of any group in the Assembly.

668 642 The year 1930 saw the genesis of a speedily repressed peasant 'Lapuan' movement in South Estonia, somewhat on the lines of its Finnish prototype, but without the latter's anti-Communist character. This organization expressed its dissatisfaction with parliamentary 'absolutism', talked of a march on Tallinn, and proposed to petition for the reduction of the number of deputies and the diminution of their salaries. A far more important movement was set on foot in March 1931 by the Ex-service Men's Federation, which passed a resolution demanding the institution of a President of the State with extensive powers, an electoral system which allowed for votes for individuals instead of for lists, and the reduction of the number of deputies, with the threat that, if the Government did not accede to these requests within three months, the Federation would proceed to a popular referendum.

578 642 There now began a three-cornered struggle between the Agrarian and Centre parliamentary groups, which favoured moderate reform; the Ex-servicemen—henceforth known as the 'Liberators'—who demanded far wider powers for the President of State than the former were willing to concede; and the Social-Democrats, who were opposed

1: Anonymous U-4 (no date) 1938 RB1 Baltic States RB1
Latvia

665 Nationalists deserve special mention, as representing the interests of the Lutheran Church.

On the left, the Social-Democratic party, which had its origin in an amalgamation of various nationalist organizations in 1904, and which before the War had been an autonomous section of the Russian Social-Democratic movement, represented the working classes and trade unions, and was affiliated to the Second International. In economic affairs it opposed the Agrarians' protectionist policy and the compensation of expropriated landlords, and in foreign policy inclined towards closer relations with the U.S.S.R., while opposing any *rapprochement* with Poland or Germany; it was also antagonistic towards the national minorities and particularly to the Germans. In the Constituent Assembly the Left had formed a single group with fifty-seven seats, but with the elections to the first *Saeima* a process of splitting into small groups began.[1] The Social-Democrats took part in only three Governments: from the first, M. Pauluks' Agrarian-Left-Centre Cabinet of 1923, they were obliged to withdraw owing to a clash between Fascist and Socialist organizations which led to street fighting; the second, M. Zamuelis' Left-Centre Coalition of January–December 1924, resigned as an indirect result of the Communist *putsch* in Estonia; while the third, M. Skujenieks' Coalition of Left and Centre parties, resigned a year later, owing to the unpopularity of the Latvian-Soviet Trade Agreement. Throughout 1929 and 1930 they were in violent opposition to the second Celmins Government, particularly in the matter of the treatment of the German minority,[2] and they declined to co-operate in M. Skujenieks' second Cabinet of May 1931–March 1933. The Socialist leaders included Fr. Vesmanis and Dr. Kalnins (Speakers of the *Saeima* in 1922–5 and 1925–8), and MM. Bastjanis, Cielens, and Celms.

No legal Communist party existed, and an extreme radical group which appeared in the third *Saeima* was dissolved by the Supreme Court in the autumn of 1933, and its seven deputies were arrested on a charge of treason.

668 *The Dictatorship.* Signs of Fascism appeared quite early in Latvia; in 1927, when a nationalist club known as the Latvian Fascists was suspected of preparing an anti-Communist *putsch*, the Government of the day, M. Skujenieks' Left-Centre coalition, authorized the organization of the Social-Democratic 'Workers' Sports League' as an auxiliary corps, and assisted it in the purchase of arms; later in the year a group of officers made an unsuccessful attempt to organize a military *putsch* as a protest against the Latvian-Soviet Trade Agree-
665 ment. In 1932 a National-Socialist party was formed, apparently unconnected with the German Nazi party, but anti-semitic in

[1] See table of election results, p. 52.

[2] See pp. 34-5.

648 reluctance to become involved in any disputes between Poland and Lithuania or the U.S.S.R.

Poland herself, although a far larger and more powerful State than her Baltic neighbours, felt her security to be even more precarious than theirs. Not only was she acutely afraid of the U.S.S.R., but the acquisition of Danzig and the 'Polish Corridor' had apparently earned the permanent hostility of Germany, while the occupation of Vilna had led, until 1938, to a state of affairs bordering on undeclared war with Lithuania. For these reasons Poland was one of the chief agents in various schemes for a Greater Baltic Union, formulated between 1919 and 1925.

As to the U.S.S.R., the policy pursued towards the Baltic States was somewhat ambiguous. With each of them a generous peace was [66] concluded, conceding full recognition of their independence. On the other hand, it was hoped, by organizing Communist movements within their frontiers, to secure their ultimate adhesion to the Russian Federation of Autonomous Republics. With this end in view everything was done at first to prevent the formation of a Baltic alliance under Polish leadership, on the principle of *divide et impera*; at the same time MM. Chicherin and Litvinov endeavoured, with ultimate success, to negotiate a network of separate non-aggression pacts with each individual State. After 1933 there was a shift of emphasis from fear of the U.S.S.R. to fear of Germany; the more powerful the latter became, the less imminent seemed the danger from the former, particularly after the Soviet entry into the League of Nations in September 1934, and the adoption of a foreign policy to harmonize with this development.

Thus the diplomatic history of North-Eastern Europe may be divided into three phases, which, being conditioned chiefly by changes in the balance of power in the wider European sphere, are more or less clearly marked, although there is a certain amount of chronological overlapping. In the first phase, lasting from 1918 to about 1925, the Baltic States were preoccupied in varying degrees with the construction of some form of defensive military alliance. In the second phase, from about 1925 to 1933, the Soviet Union redoubled the efforts which it had already made during the first phase to render its own position more secure by non-aggression and trade agreements; during this period the idea of a Greater Baltic *bloc* was discarded in favour of a much closer Little Baltic Union. In the third phase, lasting from the end of 1933 up to the present day, the resurgence of Germany led on the one hand to an unsuccessful attempt on the part of France and the U.S.S.R. to negotiate an Eastern Pact, and on the other hand to the final consolidation of the alliance between Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in September 1934.

668 with Germany, was suppressed. In Lithuania the Kaunas *putsch* of
648 June 1934 was commonly attributed to German inspiration, while in April 1936 several persons were arrested for smuggling across the Lithuanian-East Prussian frontier large quantities of anti-Lithuanian propaganda printed in Germany, inciting the Lithuanian peasants to refuse the payment of taxes. In Estonia a 'monster-trial' was held in August 1936 of 154 Estonian members of the Liberators' movement, charged with organizing a *putsch* under instructions from Germany. It is impossible to say how far German propaganda and financial assistance were really responsible for this and other similar movements, but there was undoubtedly some ground for complaint on the part of the Governments of the Baltic States.

648 The sudden change in Germany's policy towards Lithuania in 1936
439 seems the more startling in view of these barely disguised activities. On February 11 it was announced that, at the request of the Lithuanian Government, and in view of the fact that, since the recent elections in Memel, the Directorate and *Landtag* had been functioning in accordance with the terms of the Statute, the German Government was now willing to enter into negotiations for the resumption of normal trade relations. On August 5 a new trade treaty was finally concluded between the two countries, together with supplementary agreements regulating payments, border relations, and the labour rights of their respective nationals.

648 Shortly after the initiation of the German-Lithuanian trade negotiations in February 1936, Herr Hitler, in a Memorandum handed to the Locarno Powers on March 7 on the occasion of the German military reoccupation of the Rhineland, and again in a Note of March 31, had renewed his earlier offer to conclude bilateral pacts of non-aggression with the States on Germany's north-eastern and south-eastern frontiers, and had added (in the Memorandum) that, since the Lithuanian Government had to some extent corrected its attitude with regard to Memel, he no longer excluded Lithuania from this offer. The French Government pointed out, in its reply of April 8, that Germany had refused to admit that such pacts could be included in a system of collective security, or that they could be accompanied by guarantees of mutual assistance, and emphasized that France 'could not conceive of a settlement of western security for which she would have to disinterest herself in the security of the rest of Europe'. The British *questionnaire*, handed to the German Foreign Minister on May 7, included an inquiry as to whether the German Government suggested that the proposed pacts should follow the general outline of such pacts given to Sir John Simon by Baron von Neurath on March 26, 1935, and whether it agreed that they might also be guaranteed by mutual assistance arrangements; the

642 dissolved it on March 22, in spite of a warning from the Allied
361 Powers. The Powers, therefore, instituted proceedings against
648 Lithuania at the Hague Court on April 11.[1] Judgement was not delivered until August 11,[1] when the Court decided that the Governor was entitled, for the protection of the interests of the Lithuanian State, and if no other action could be taken, to dismiss the President of the Directorate in case of serious acts which violated the Memel Convention, or which were calculated to prejudice the sovereignty of Lithuania; that such dismissal did not by itself involve the dismissal of the other members of the Directorate; that the dismissal of Herr Böttcher and the appointment of M. Simaitis were in order; but that the dissolution of the Diet was not in order.

Meanwhile the elections for the new Diet had taken place in May, and, in spite of German accusations that the Lithuanians had been guilty of shameless manipulation, the latter only succeeded in securing five seats. As usual the elections were followed by a peaceful interlude, in consequence of the appointment of a more liberal-minded Governor, M. Bylys, to succeed Colonel Merkys, and of a German President of the Directorate, Dr. Schreiber. In August a financial agreement was concluded between the Lithuanian Government and the Memel Territory.

648 *The Advent of National-Socialism.* The Schreiber Directorate's chances of stabilizing conditions were to a large extent destroyed by the accession of Herr Hitler to power in Germany in January 1933, and were still further diminished by the German-Polish *rapprochement* of 1934, up till when the common hostility of Germany and Lithuania to Poland had exercised a moderating influence on their mutual relations.

361 In the summer of 1933 two Nazi parties were founded in Memel;
668 the first, led by Pastor von Sass, with a Left Wing programme, was
661 called the *Christliche-Sozialistische Arbeitsgemeinschaft* (C.S.A.): the
648 second and more conservative, under Dr. Neumann, was known as the *Sovog* (*Sozialistische Volksorganisation*).[2] Alive to the danger of the movement, the Lithuanian Government in November 1933 appointed a new Governor, Dr. Novakas, to suppress it. Numerous foreign officials were dismissed—most of them citizens of the Reich; labour permits issued to foreigners in private employment were withdrawn; a law for the Defence of the State enacted on February 8, 1934, penalizing members of seditious organizations, was followed by the dissolution of both the Nazi parties and the arrest of Dr.

2. [1932 -- Analy. 1]

[1] For text see *The Permanent Court of International Justice*, Series A/B, No. 49, p. 337.

[2] The Nazi party in Germany supported the *Sovog* in preference to the C.S.A., and appears to have attempted in July to unify the two parties by recognizing Dr. Neumann as leader of all the Nazis in Memel.

Neumann and other leaders of the *Sovog*. This action called forth a German Note of protest, and the suspension of all local goods traffic across the frontier.[1]

In June Dr. Schreiber was dismissed on a charge of encouraging the Nazi movement, and was replaced at first by Dr. Reizgys, and later by M. Bruvelaitis, both of whom were Memellanders and appointed purely Lithuanian Directorates. The authorities now pursued the policy of reducing the Diet to impotence, firstly by disqualifying members of the Diet who belonged to 'seditious organisations',[2] and secondly by arranging that all the Lithuanian deputies should absent themselves, so that, on the rare occasions when the Diet met, a quorum was not present. In December the trial of 122 Nazis began in Kaunas, on charges of conspiracy for the reunion of Memel with Germany through armed revolt. Four prisoners were also accused of the murder of an official named Jesuttis, who was alleged to have betrayed Nazi plans to the Lithuanian authorities. Undeterred by indirect German pressure exerted through the reinforcement of troops on the frontier, or by representations made by the Guarantor Powers, the Court delivered heavy sentences in March 1935, including four death sentences on the murder charge.[3]

As a result of an appeal made by Herr Hitler during the visit of Sir John Simon and Mr. Eden to Berlin in March, a joint Note was addressed to Lithuania by Great Britain, France, and Italy on April 19, 1935,[4] urging an early meeting of the Diet, and the constitution of a Directorate possessing its confidence; the Lithuanian reply was unsatisfactory, but, in the meantime, M. Novakas had been succeeded as Governor by the more moderate M. Kurkauskas, and the German parties had been invited to collaborate in the reconstitution of the Directorate. Shortly after their refusal to do so, the three-year term of the Diet expired, on May 4, and new elections were not held until September. In the meantime the electoral law was amended in such a way as to deprive several candidates (including Dr. Schreiber) of the now united front of pro-German parties, known as the *Einheitsliste*,[5] of their electoral rights and Lithuanian citizen-

[1] Even the transit through Germany of goods destined for Lithuania was later prohibited.

[2] The non-Nazi, but German, *Landwirtschaftspartei* was now included in this category.

[3] These were later commuted to life imprisonment.

[4] In July 1934 the Powers had, in reply to a German Note complaining of the situation, adopted the line that complaints should be addressed to the League Council; and, although a committee of jurists appointed by the Council to consider two petitions presented by the Vice-President of the Diet in the following September had pronounced that infringements of the Statute had taken place, the matter had not been brought up for further discussion by the Council—owing, perhaps, to the pre-occupation of the Powers with the Saar Plebiscite.

[5] The *Einheitsliste* included all the German parties except the Social-Democrats, as well as a number of Lithuanians. It aimed ostensibly at the maintenance of the autonomous régime, but was supported by vigorous propaganda from the German Reich.